EXHIBIT 6

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	
5	IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION MDL NO. 2311
6	/
7	
8	STATUS CONFERENCE / MOTION HEARING
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARIANNE O. BATTANI United States District Judge
10	Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard
11	Detroit, Michigan Wednesday, November 13, 2013
12	APPEARANCES:
13	Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs:
14	
15	ROBERT W. BOSSLET, III KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES & FRIEDMAN, L.L.P. 1633 Broadway
16	New York, NY 10019 (212) 506-1868
17	THOMAS C. BRIGHT
18	
	GOLD, BENNET, CERA & SIDENER, L.L.P. 595 Market Street Suite 2300
19	595 Market Street , Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105
19 20	595 Market Street , Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 777-2230
	595 Market Street , Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 777-2230 WILLIAM G. CALDES SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.
20	595 Market Street , Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 777-2230 WILLIAM G. CALDES SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C. 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103
20 21	595 Market Street , Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 777-2230 WILLIAM G. CALDES SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C. 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
20 21 22	595 Market Street , Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 777-2230 WILLIAM G. CALDES SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C. 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103
20212223	595 Market Street , Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 777-2230 WILLIAM G. CALDES SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C. 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103

ACAPs and the plaintiffs in wire harness.

Paragraph 112 of wire harness, defendants' pricing actions regarding their sales of wire harness products to automobile manufacturers had an impact on prices for wire harness products for all direct purchasers of wire harness products throughout the United States, and that's the -- those are the allegations which Your Honor upheld in the pages that I cited to the Court earlier.

Paragraph 69 of the ACAP complaint, we allege the winning price is also used when the OEM suppliers that were not part of RFQ process purchased, so that is another fact. Defendants may dispute it, they may say that price doesn't take effect until some years later, we say it is the price that is used.

I stood before Your Honor in the wire harness argument, I posited the hypothetical of the beverage distributors, the bottled water, the soda distributors, if they had a bid-rigging scheme in the city to the big hotels and that becomes the price that the bars or the smaller restaurants would pay.

We have looked at materials, we have looked at documents, there's confidentiality and cross orders. I'm not to disclose what those say except to say we stand before the Court and assert that theory with respect to this claim.

There was a rigged-bid price, that is the price that becomes

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Robert L. Smith, Official Court Reporter of
4	the United States District Court, Eastern District of
5	Michigan, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28,
6	United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the
7	foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcript
8	taken in the matter of In re: Autmotive Parts Antitrust
9	Litigation, Case No. 12-md-02311, on Wednesday,
10	November 13, 2013.
11	
12	
13	s/Robert L. Smith
14	Robert L. Smith, RPR, CSR 5098 Federal Official Court Reporter
15	United States District Court Eastern District of Michigan
16	
17	
18	Date: 12/02/2013
19	Detroit, Michigan
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	